

Minutes for Partnership PDT Meeting St. Louis Mo. March 17.

1. Discussed Talking points. How do we want partnerships put into O&M training? Have either Tom Fleegeer or Debra talk about it. Agreed to have Tom Fleegeer do it. Cori agrees to talk to him. Have the Partnership section last at least an Hour.
2. Tool to evaluate effectiveness of a partnership. Mike was lead. HE said it was more difficult than he initially thought and would have a draft ready next day.
3. Identify new SME's Debra reported on this. She named off several new SME's: Susan Nee, HQ Counsel; Janice Howell, HQ Counsel; Donna Asbury, APPL. Don Dunwoody could be a liaison. He is looking at revamp the Challenge partnership program. Greg brought up establishing a trouble shooting team to help local programs break down the barriers. Nothing was ever clearly defined as to what Don's team was to do. Everyone believes that it should fall under the partnership team with Don being part of the implementation. Use the Gateway as depository of information. Have an agency answer.

Greg brought up a Forest Service model that he thought we might use. Establish this team as a policy team and Don's as a troubleshooter team. Cori brought up establish RITS and possibly mini RITs. Debra suggested using the Sign MCX as example for how the team and Dunwoody's team should work. Chris suggested that we ask George let the program remain with the PDT until its work is finished as opposed to having Don start a parallel program. Greg says there is no decision making model. It slows down the process by having to kick it up the ladder. He said the decision process should be powered down to shorten the process. Cori suggested it could be a series of flow charts that show decision points on which way to go i.e. if you have this, then do this. Policy isn't defined enough to hand the program, to Don. The team needs to build the program before handing it off to Don..

Jeff will draft a recommendation with assistance from the team.

4. Update Gateway Page. Cori said that she would contact Virginia Dickerson first thing when she gets back to office about posting minutes, philosophy, and talking points on the Gateway. Cori said Kathy Perales suggested a change for the front page on the public partnership website. She recommended that we look at the US Fish and Wildlife web page as model for easier navigation. The Visitor page should use key words that the public recognizes. Cori will send the USFWS page to everyone for them to look at and comment All comments/suggestions/changes for the partnership pages should go to Cori and she will coordinate with Debra to get them posted. Cori suggested we may want to use push technology to announce the Handshake program. The team was concerned about whom they are going to push the messages to and what it would look like. Some on the team think it looks like junk mail and will be automatically deleted. Cori will check on this. The team consensus was that push technology should be tested elsewhere first to see how it works.
5. Clarify Use of logos. Debra and Cori. Debra will defer on this pending more information during the workshop when OC is there (Note: OC was unable to attend the workshop so questions should be sent to Debra for resolution; they should be detailed enough that OC can give us answers.

6. Comment Card Questions. It is now sitting with Debra. She will work on announcement letter.
7. Seed Money Program. The entire team will be included in the selection process. Once packages arrive, there will be a conference call with team members. Greg and Jeff will do the first cut by determining if directions were followed. Once the first cut is made, the teleconference call will be scheduled with the rest of the team. The grants must be awarded by June 1st. We need to minimize evaluation time. Everything must be documented. All documentation needs to stay with the nominations. Note that this is like mid-year dollars (in other words, it's a late start for work). Next year we hope to have a longer window.
8. Upfront Funding Issues. Upfront funding is not a problem if it is a one-year project. If it is more than one year, then it is a problem. Are we making challenge partnerships too long? Do we break out multiple year projects by doing only one year's financial sheet at a time? Do we use the revolving fund as a working capital fund? John Breiling made recommendations in a memo to Debra that may answer some of these questions. He suggests that funding authorization permits such actions but the regulations are behind the times and do not match the authorization. For TEA 21, we must have prior arrangements with a state that will allow funding up front. A draft policy letter for HQ signature needs to be done. Another issue is where we document such actions in CEFMS.
9. Presidents '05 budget. We are to help the Fee demonstration projects with partnering issues.
10. Meeting was adjourned.